



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

largely on the evidence, wholly new, he assures us, that he has here brought to light concerning the "Green Ribbon Club," the headquarters of the party. He has carefully ascertained its membership and traced its history in these pages. On his other point, the annual Pope-burnings and the electioneering methods of the Whigs, he has similarly produced much curious information, deserving of careful study. If one were to offer a criticism on his history it would be perhaps, that however unlovely, and at times hypocritical, were the methods and professions of the Whigs, there was more excuse than he is willing to admit for men living only a century after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and its approval by the Pope, for a blind terror of Rome and its ways that to us, after three times that interval has elapsed, is not easy to realize. One of the most definite lessons that history has to offer is that the Pope and his followers reaped as they had sown. If our forefathers looked on a Roman priest much as in the present day we should look on a man-eating tiger, it was not without a cause. For, as Sir George inadvertently admits, though it is of the Puritans that he speaks, "to those who accept the doctrines of exclusive salvation . . . persecution must ever be the first of religious duties."

William Sacheverell himself has virtually been discovered by the author. A remarkable parliamentary orator and a leader of the Country party, he seems to have taken the leading part in suggesting the Bill of Exclusion. An exquisite frontispiece gives us his portrait. Of the illustrations, some fifty in number and all taken from contemporary sources, it would be difficult to speak too highly. Indeed, the book, which is printed at the author's private press, is not merely of real value to the students of a fascinating period, but is a gem to be prized by collectors. One can only regret that, of necessity, its possession must be confined to few.

J. H. ROUND.

Municipal Government in Continental Europe. By ALBERT SHAW, Ph.D. (New York : The Century Co. 1895. Pp. xii, 505.)

In a former volume Dr. Shaw undertook to explain to Americans the municipal system of Great Britain and what it accomplishes. He now undertakes a similar task with reference to the cities of Continental Europe. The thoroughness of his studies, made for the most part in close contact with the institutions under discussion, and his clear insight into their working, have led to the production of two volumes which place all students of municipal government under obligations to him.

The impression has prevailed in the United States that the rapid growth of urban population is a peculiarly American phenomenon — an impression which Dr. Shaw's books ought to correct. Urban development is the accompaniment of industrial development ; and the latter is a characteristic of Western civilization wherever it is found. From the fact that the industrial revolution took its rise and attained its highest development in the British Isles, it is a natural sequence that there the largest proportion of

urban population is to be found. Practically two-thirds of the Scottish people now live as townsfolk. Town life will soon prevail for three-fourths of the English people. Even France, the home of the peasant-proprietor, cannot escape the universal movement. In the five years from 1886 to 1891, there was an increase of 340,000 in the population of the fifty-six largest cities and towns, while the total increase of the whole population of France was only 125,000. The same phenomenon is to be noted in Germany, Belgium, and Holland, as well as in southern and southeastern Europe, where municipal activity is putting a new aspect on the historic cities of the Italian peninsula and the Danube valley.

One of the most notable chapters in the history of cities during the last half-century is concerned with the transformation of Paris and Vienna. These mediæval capitals were an intolerable anachronism. Through the activity of Baron Haussmann, Paris has become the typical modern city. Whatever the political follies of the Second Empire may have been, its existence is to some extent justified by the superb system of avenues and boulevards, parks and squares, public buildings and sewers, with which it has endowed the national capital. Vienna also has undergone a metamorphosis as striking as that of Paris. By the removal of the fortifications surrounding the capital at the accession of Francis Joseph in 1848, an area greater than that of the whole inner city was laid bare. Systematic plans for its improvement were devised, and their execution was intrusted to a commission appointed by the Emperor and accountable to the central government. The wisdom of this policy has long been acknowledged, and it is a sufficient answer to Dr. Shaw's criticism of Chicago for not improving her opportunity after the fire of 1871. "The town council," he says of Vienna, "could not have adopted so liberal a plan." This is much more true of the Chicago Board of Aldermen; and Chicago possessed no enlightened emperor to save her from her mistakes. Such far-reaching projects as those involved in the reconstruction of Paris and Vienna cannot be looked for in America until more efficient means of municipal administration prevail.

The municipal system of France grew out of the changes inaugurated by the Revolution. When the instrument since known as the Constitution of 1791 was in process of formation, the first part of it to be worked out minutely was the regulations for the creation of new municipalities and local self-government. The passion for abstract political truths, the desire for simplicity and uniformity of administration, which characterized the members of the Constituent Assembly, are clearly reflected in the municipal system of 1789. The ancient provinces, the very names of which were the embodiment of centuries of French history, were abolished, and a geometrical system of departments, districts, cantons, and communes took their place. The system had two great faults. It was too elaborate for the small towns, and the people had not yet learned the lesson of self-government sufficiently to operate it with success. But the series of departments on which it was based remains to this day.

As the political ideas of the government at Paris have changed, the

municipal system has been correspondingly modified. By 1795, a tendency toward centralization had set in, and its effect on local government is seen in the substitution of a *Commissaire*, appointed by the Directory, for the *Syndic Procureur*, who was elected by the people of the department. But this was only the beginning. After 1800, "there existed in France no authority that could repair a village bridge, or light the streets of a town, but such as owed its appointment to the central government."¹ The prefect, an old officer under a new name, now made his appearance. The old district of the system of 1789 was revived under the name of *arrondissement*. After the Revolution of 1848, confidence in the principle of municipal home-rule dominated legislation. But with the establishment of the Second Empire, the administrative machinery of the First Napoleon was revived. The influence of the Emperor was exerted for municipal progress, but its educative effect upon citizenship was bad. When the Third Republic was established, conservative influences prevailed to such an extent that the government was unwilling to relinquish all control of municipal affairs. But the experience of the years immediately following showed this conservative timidity to have been ill-founded, and the central government came to exercise only a nominal control. In 1884, the great municipal code was enacted and every vestige of earlier legislation was repealed. The code consists of 168 articles, the first of which says, "The municipal corps of each commune shall be composed of the municipal council, the mayor, and one or more adjuncts." The order in which these officers are designated is significant of their relative position in the French administrative system. But Paris is still actively governed, as under Louis Napoleon, by the prefect of the Seine and the prefect of police, appointed by the general government and amenable to the Minister of the Interior.

As a whole, the German system does not differ radically from the French. Its framework is not marked by the symmetry and uniformity which characterize the French system, but it accomplishes practically the same ends. The governmental reforms of Stein, Hardenberg, and their successors were not accompanied by a complete change of municipal machinery as was the case in France; but the existing institutions were made to serve new purposes and satisfy the requirements of new conditions. The result is an admirable adaptation of means to ends. The central government maintains a more direct control of the police in Germany than in France, and municipal suffrage is more restricted. The three-class system of voting prevails, so that property interests are largely represented in the city councils.

The German city is pre-eminently a social organism. At almost every point the life of the citizen is brought into contact with the city. There is no limit to the functions that it undertakes. A bare list of its enterprises is bewildering in its comprehensiveness. In their methods of conducting municipal business, and especially in dealing with corporations operating public franchises, the Germans have set an example worthy to be followed. The contrast between German and American methods is well stated thus :

¹ Fyffe, *Modern Europe*, I. 208.

"In studying these German contracts one is always impressed with a sense of the first-class legal, financial, and technical ability that the city is able to command; while American contracts always impress one with the unlimited astuteness and ability of the gentlemen representing the private corporations."

Dr. Shaw has given us the most complete account of municipal government in Europe that has yet appeared. He has not only described the French and German systems, but has also devoted chapters to the municipalities of Belgium, Holland, Italy, and Spain. His work is marked throughout by the lucid arrangement and careful scholarship for which he is so well known. A few errors, however, may be noted. The number of departments into which France was divided in 1789 was eighty-three, not eighty-nine. In his treatment of the cantonal divisions of 1795, the author conveys the impression that the cantons were new creations of the legislation of that year. This, however, is not the case. The cantons were a part of the legislation of 1789-1790. But there they were merely electoral districts of little importance. What the constitution of 1795 did for them was to increase their importance by conferring upon them the functions of the districts which were abolished. But the most serious deficiency of this volume — and the same may be said of its predecessor — is the total absence of bibliographical data. Perhaps in subsequent editions Dr. Shaw will see fit to remedy this defect.

CARL EVANS BOYD.

Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century. An Inquiry into the Material Condition of the People, based upon Original and Contemporaneous Records. By PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE. (New York and London: Macmillan and Co. 1896. Two vols., pp. xix, 634, 647.)

A LARGE portion of this work relates to the economic history of Virginia in the seventeenth century, in which particular field it is, I believe, unique and its value unquestioned. About one-third of the book is devoted to the period of the Virginia Companies (1606-1624). This was an important period, especially after 1609; but beginnings are always interesting, and the comparatively large space given to this brief period should not be criticised. Mr. Bruce regards Captain John Smith as "the real founder of the community," and much of this space is given up, directly or indirectly, to supporting this view; that is, to taking Captain Smith's side of the issue which it pleased him and his writers to make with the founders of Virginia. So many of the author's ideas have been derived from the misleading statements in Smith's works, which are unfair criticisms of the managers of the first colony of Virginia (1606-1609) and of the Virginia Company of London from 1609 to 1624, that Mr. Bruce (whose honesty of purpose and of opinion I do not question) has failed to convey a fair idea of that company, its purposes and accomplishments, or to deal fairly with those who really succeeded in planting and estab-